



EPA Puget Sound Financial and Ecosystem Accounting Tracking System (FEATS)

Photo by Rebecca Pirtle, Editor, Kingston Community News (Doe-Kag-Wats Estuary of the Suquamish Tribe)

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Federal Grant Number	PA-00J322-01	*2a. Reporting Period Start Date:	4/1/2011	*2b. Reporting Period End Date:	9/30/2011
3. Recipient Organization (Name and complete address including zip code) Name: Northwest Indian Fisheries Commissi Address 1: 6730 Martin Way East Address 2: City: Olympia State: WA Zip Code: 98516-5540		4. Project Manager Contact Information Name: Terry Wright Phone: (360) 528-4336 Ext: Fax: () - Email: wright@nwifc.org			
5a. Program (RFP) Tribal Lead Org	5b. Project Title Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission Lead Organization Award	*6. Collaborating Organizations/Partners None <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subawardee 21 Tribes/Tribal Consortiums			

Submission Instructions: EPA fills in the white boxes. Grantee fills in the yellow boxes (boxes with asterisks). Refer to guidance document for how to fill out the boxes. After completing the form, save and e-mail it to the Project Officer and cc: the Technical Monitor.	Project Officer: Lisa Chang U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Email: chang.lisa@epa.gov Technical Monitor: Daniel Steinborn U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Email: steinborn.daniel@epa.gov	*7a. Name/Title of Person Submitting Report	Tiffany Waters PS Recovery Proj. Coordinator
		*7b. Date Report Submitted	11/30/2011

FUNDING/COST ANALYSIS

8a. Total EPA Assistance Amount Awarded:	\$3,000,000.00	8b. Funding Year (Federal Fiscal Year Funds Appropriated)	FY 2010 ----- ----- -----	*9. Total EPA Amount Expended To-Date:	\$378,775.04	*10. Funds Drawn Down from EPA To-Date:	\$188,902.00
11. Match Amount Required		*12. Total Match Amount Expended and Documented To-Date:	\$0.00	*13. Have you experienced any cost overruns or high unit costs?	No		
*14. What issues or questions do you need the EPA Project Officer or Technical Monitor to respond to?		None					

BUDGET UPDATE

	15a. APPROVED BUDGET			*15b. SPENT TO-DATE		
	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL	EPA	MATCH	TOTAL
Personnel	\$56,787.00		\$56,787.00	\$38,653.35		\$38,653.35
Fringe Benefits	\$17,769.03		\$17,769.03	\$13,374.47		\$13,374.47
Travel	\$2,000.00		\$2,000.00	\$629.33		\$ 629.33
Equipment			\$ 0.00			\$ 0.00
Supplies	\$3,115.99		\$3,115.99	\$2,115.47		\$2,115.47
Contracts	\$12,500.00		\$12,500.00			\$ 0.00
Other	\$2,866,855.60		\$2,866,855.60	\$299,760.06		\$299,760.06
TOTAL DIRECT CHARGES	\$2,959,027.62		\$2,959,027.62	\$354,532.68		\$354,532.68
Indirect Charges	\$40,972.37		\$40,972.37	\$24,242.36		\$24,242.36
TOTAL	\$3,000,000.00		\$3,000,000.00	\$378,775.04		\$378,775.04
*Explain Any Discrepancies:	Due to the annual ASAP.GOV system closure, the NWIFC is required to anticipate cash flow requirements for year-end closure. The NWIFC operates on a reimbursement system with our subrecipient tribes. We are unable to determine how much revenue will be required from month to month. The NWIFC underestimated actual expenditures for this reporting period.					

ECOSYSTEM GOALS ADDRESSED

16a. Primary Goal	Healthy Habitat
16b. Additional Goals	Healthy Species Water Quality Water Quantity ----- ----- -----

DIRECT THREATS ADDRESSED

17a. Primary Threat	-----
17b. Secondary Threat(s)	Climate Change Dams/Levees/Tidegates Derelict Gear/Vessels Development Invasive Species - Terrestrial Invasive Species - Marine
	Large Scale Timber Harvest Shoreline Armoring Surface Water Loading/Runoff from the Built Env -----

LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND ACTION AGENDA

18a. Strategic Priorities Employed	Priority A Priority B Priority C Priority D Priority E
18b. Near-Term Actions Supported	
18c. Other Actions Supported	

LINKAGES TO EPA PUGET SOUND MEASURES

19. Measure(s)	Habitat Restored/Protected ----- -----
----------------	--

LINKAGES TO PUGET SOUND DASHBOARD INDICATORS

20a. Primary Indicator	-----
20b. Additional Indicators	Marine Water Quality Index Stream Flows Below Critical Levels Wild Chinook Salmon Pacific Herring Shoreline Armoring

PROJECT LOCATION

21a. Latitude		21b. Longitude	
21c. Hydrologic Unit Code	171100 - Sound-wide	-----	-----
21d. Action Area	Sound-wide	-----	-----

MEASURES OF SUCCESS (Key Grant Outputs)

*22a. Description (e.g., "shellfish beds reopened")	*22b. Unit (e.g., "acres")	*22c. Project Target ("number")	*22d. Project Measure To-Date ("number")
Developed and distributed final RFP to 21 Tribes and Tribal Consortiums	RFP Document	1	1
Reviewed 21 subrecipient proposals for RFP adherence and sent all subrecipient proposals to the EPA/PSP Review Team for comment and review.	Subrecipient Proposal	21	21
Developed and engaged in a Coordination Plan, disseminating and sharing subrecipient project information	Subrecipient Proposal Information	21	21
Approved 21 subrecipient proposals and sent award notification and contracts to all subrecipients.	Approved Workplans	21	21
Conducted 7 subrecipient site visits to assess project progress and compliance with award requirements.	Site Visits	7	1

PROJECT MILESTONES

Instructions: In the tables below, please explain your progress toward meeting agreed outputs for the period, **reasons for slippages**, and any additional information including **reflections, lessons learned, and/or thoughtful analysis**. When appropriate, include analysis and information of **cost overruns or high unit costs**, and changes to work plan or budget not requiring prior approval from EPA. We encourage photo documentation - please attach to the report as a separate document.

23a. Work Plan Component/Task: 1. Program development and launch

23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed: D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.

***23c. Estimated Costs:** \$3,152.80

Actual Costs to Date: \$6,726.76

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
1.1	Communication/outreach plan	1.14.11	COMPLETED	Communication/outreach plan	NWIFC developed a communication/outreach plan that consisted of: (1) a transmittal note for the RFP; (2) a mailing distribution list that ensured that

					<p>all eligible entities were notified equitably, timely, and thoroughly; and (3) a target date for releasing the RFP.</p> <p>Due to our previous interactions and current relationships with our member tribes, we had in place a distribution list that contained pertinent tribal contacts. We vetted this distribution list to ensure that the proper contacts were included and additionally amended the list to include contacts from the two non-member tribes and two tribal consortiums. We have continued to add to this distribution list as needed and requested.</p>
1.2	RFP development and distribution	1.25.11	COMPLETED	Final RFP distributed	<p>NWIFC developed the final RFP through close consultation with the EPA, utilizing and editing the FY08 proposal to finalize the FY10 fundamental components and timeline. Additions to the FY10 RFP included: (1) language that fully described the intent of these funds; (2) requirements for all projects that collect environmental data to have a QAPP in place prior to data collection; and (3) logic model terminology. While we didn't include the traditional logic model table format, we utilized the logic model terminology to request specific outputs and outcomes per task.</p> <p>In consultation with the EPA Project Officer, we finalized the proposal review process and timeline. As planned, we distributed the final RFP on 1.25.11.</p>
1.3	Coordination plan	1.31.11	COMPLETED	Coordination plan	NWIFC developed a coordination plan that can be executed

					throughout the project period and includes: (1) ensuring that the PSP is aware of the aims and activities of the subrecipient projects by enlisting them as a key reviewer of these subawards; (2) engaging the EPA Project Officer to discuss the capacity awards that the subrecipient projects are concurrently receiving, in order to avoid duplicative funding efforts; (3) engaging in existing processes and groups to disseminate and share subrecipient project information, including the ECB, the Leadership Council, the PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and the PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus; (4) participating in LO meetings to ensure that other LOs are fully award of our subrecipient projects and vice versa; (5) an existing NWIFC website that is dedicated to information related to Puget Sound Partnership and Treaty Tribes of Western Washington.

23a. Work Plan Component/Task: 2. Award cycle					
23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed: D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.					
*23c. Estimated Costs: \$1,439,533.41 Actual Costs to Date: \$334,531.07 (If required by PO)					
23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks

2.1	Reviewing subaward proposals	7.6.2011	COMPLETED	Project files set up; comments from all reviewers documented; input shared with applicants	All project files have been set up, with all digital files held by the Projects Coordinator and all final hard copies held by the Contracts Specialist. NIWFC has received, documented, and shared input from the NWIFC, EPA, and PSP review teams with all 21 subrecipients.
2.2	Receive final proposals and make subawards	8.2.2011	COMPLETED	Final workplans addressing key input received; 65% of funds awarded by 2/28; 100% by 4/30; all recipients informed of award requirements	NWIFC has successfully communicated with all 21 subrecipients to address key input and all final workplans have been received, approved, and awarded. 65% of funds were awarded by 5/19/2011 and 100% of funds were awarded by 8/2/2011. All recipients have been informed of award requirements, as included in their NWIFC contract (including EPA Administrative and Programmatic Conditions; Anti-lobbying Certification; MBE/WBE Certification; Federal Financial Report; EPA FEATS; OMB Circulars A-87, A-133 & A-102; 15 CFR Part 24 & Part 28; 2 CFR Part 1326, Subpart C; and 40 CFR Part 34). The review and final approval process took longer than anticipated due to: (1) the amount of proposals that have needed revisions before being sent to the EPA/PSP Review Team were more than we expected. We worked with subrecipients to polish their proposals to a minimum standard before sending them off for broader review; (2) the submission process took longer than expected with the vast majority of subrecipients (13) sending in their proposals on the

					official due date of 3.15.11; and (3) the post-packaged review revision process in which we worked with our subrecipients to address reviewer comments within their workplans took longer than expected.

23a. Work Plan Component/Task: 3. Program management					
23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed: D.3., NTA 3: Fund tribes to participate in the refinement and implementation of the Action Agenda, including salmon recovery plans.					
*23c. Estimated Costs: \$22,069.61 Actual Costs to Date: \$17,256.81 (If required by PO)					
23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks
3.1	Support/meet with awardees	Ongoing	CURRENT	All subrecipients understand applicable award requirements	All subrecipients have been contacted via phone, email, or in person and the appropriate support has continued to be given in regards to the award process and applicable award requirements. The Projects Coordinator has retained and filed all email correspondence and has maintained a phone log tracking all substantive phone conversations.
3.2	Conduct project monitoring	Ongoing	CURRENT	Subawardee reporting requirements met; site visits conducted to 33% of funded projects (year 1); site visit and progress reports prepared and made	In anticipation of the first subrecipient reporting due on 10.31.11, the Projects Coordinator pre-populated all 21 subrecipient FEATS reports with their FY10 project specific information and emailed each subrecipient project

				<p>available; all recipients in compliance with applicable award requirements</p>	<p>coordinator their FEATS report on 9.30.11, providing 30 days to complete their report. Upon receiving FEATS reports in 30 days, NWIFC will review subrecipient progress to ensure that all subrecipients are in compliance with applicable award requirements. Additionally, once a subrecipient FEATS report has been reviewed and accepted, the Projects Coordinator will post the report, including all attachments, to the 'Tribal Project Updates' section of the PSP/NWIFC website.</p> <p>One site visit has occurred to Makah Nation on 8.23.11 in which the Projects Coordinator and the Salmon Recovery Projects Coordinator traveled to Neah Bay to assess Makah's project progress and compliance with award requirements (including, but not limited to - adherence to workplan timeline; progress and completion of tasks and outputs; QAPP development, review, and/or approval status; obstacles or problems encountered by subrecipient; progress report requirement adherence; review of funds spent and/or high award balances, if applicable; and subrecipient questions regarding award conditions, including reporting requirements). All site visit reports are held at NWIFC and are available upon request. Six additional site visits will occur to monitor subrecipient progress and award requirement compliance; a definitive schedule for such visits has not yet been set.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

3.3	Execute coordination plan	Ongoing	CURRENT	Exchange of project lists between LOs	<p>NWIFC continued to: (1) engage the PSP as a key reviewer of these subawards; (2) meet with the EPA Project Officer to discuss relevant capacity awards of the subrecipients to ensure funding duplication did not occur; (3) participate in ECB, Leadership Council, PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus meetings, and developed a list of subrecipient projects and presented this list ot other LOs and interested parties at the PSP Ecosystem Coordination Board meeting on 4.1.11; (4) participate in scheduled LO meetings; and (5) update the PSP/NWIFC website to include meeting notes for ECB, Leadership Council, PSP Salmon Recovery Council, and PSP/Federal/Tribal Caucus meetings.</p> <p>A personnel shift has occurred and NWIFC has enlisted a new Puget Sound Policy Analyst. In the past, this position was responsible for engaging in the scheduled LO meetings. However, NWIFC has been instructed that this position, as it is funded directly under the NWIFC EPA Capacity award, is not eligible to invoice their participation in the LO meetings to the Capacity award. Thus, in the next reporting period, the Projects Coordinator will instead participate in the scheduled LO meetings. In addition to general information exchange and collaboration that will occur within these meetings, the Projects Coordinator will continue to provide a list of our subrecipient</p>
-----	---------------------------	---------	---------	---------------------------------------	---

					projects to the LO group for all additional fiscal years of funding.
3.4	Reporting and adaptive management	Ongoing	CURRENT	LO reporting requirements fulfilled; quarterly check-in meetings/calls with EPA PO	Administration of the program, including periodic progress review, has been coordinated by the Projects Coordinator, under the tutelage of the Salmon Recovery Projects Coordinator. NWIFC continues to be in close contact with NWIFC's EPA Project Officer, engaging in regular check-ins to clarify EPA proposal reviews and discuss challenges faced within the review process. The EPA Projects Officer has been extremely helpful and communicative during the subrecipient review and approval process. The LO reporting requirements are in the process of being fulfilled. The Projects Coordinator requested and received a 30-day extension on the NWIFC LO FEATS report (originally due to EPA on 10.31.11).

23a. Work Plan Component/Task:

23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**

Actual Costs to Date:

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks

23a. Work Plan Component/Task:

23b. Action Agenda Action(s) Addressed:

***23c. Estimated Costs:**

Actual Costs to Date:

(If required by PO)

23d. Sub-Task No.	23e. Sub-Task Description	*23f. Date	*23g. Status	23h. Outputs/Deliverables	*23i. Remarks

CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS (specific to reporting period)

*24a. Task No., Sub-Task No.	*24b. Challenge	*24c. Solution
Task 2.2 (Review Final Proposals and Make Subawards):	<p>The review process took longer than anticipated due to:</p> <p>(1) the number of proposals that have needed revisions (a "pre-review") before being sent to the EPA/PSP Review Team were more than we expected. We worked with applicants to polish their proposals to a minimum standard before sending off for broader review;</p> <p>(2) the submission process took longer than expected with vast majority of applicants (13) not sending in their final proposals until the official due date of 3.15.11; and</p> <p>(3) the post-packaged review revision process in</p>	<p>We provided the appropriate guidance to our subrecipients in regards to amending their workplans to reflect dates that were more representative of when award funds would be available to be spent.</p> <p>We have taken the NWIFC pre-review, EPA/PSP review periods, and post-packaged review periods into consideration in developing our FY11 timeline.</p>

	<p>which we worked with our subrecipients to address reviewer comments within their workplans took longer than expected.</p> <p>Overall, as there was an extended pre-review period for many of our subrecipients; the technical EPA and PSP reviews averaged 2.5 and 2 weeks, respectively; and the post-packed review revision process averaged 4.5 weeks (with a range between 0-11 weeks), the 2/28 date in which 65% of funds were to be awarded and the 4/30 date in which 100% of funds were to be awarded were therefore not feasible.</p>	
Task 3.2 (Conduct Project Monitoring):	The QAPP process (general flow including submission, review, and approval) for subrecipients was unclear.	NWIFC communicated with the EPA PO and we collaboratively agreed on an official QAPP flow process in which our subrecipients would cc the EPA PO and Project Coordinator while interacting with the EPA QA office directly for the submission, review, and approval of their QAPPs. It was agreed that the Projects Coordinator, while not responsible for review of the subrecipient QAPPs, would be added to the signature page of all subrecipient QAPPs for the purposes of administrative flow. Additionally, the Projects Coordinator created a tracking sheet to track the submission, review, and approval of all subrecipient QAPPs and she will communicate with the EPA PO regarding the status of subrecipient QAPPs.

HIGHLIGHTS/LESSONS LEARNED/REFLECTIONS

<p>*25.</p> <p>(1) HIGHLIGHT: While all 21 subrecipient proposals contain projects that will and are substantially contributing to the restoration and protection of Puget Sound, we have chosen to highlight the progress of the following five workplans:</p> <p>Skagit River System Cooperative - Assessment of the Geomorphological and Ecological Consequences of Dike Breaching vs. Dike Removal for Estuarine Habitat Restoration: The SRSC successfully completed cross-section surveys of 55 reference marsh channels in the Skagit Delta, with preliminary analysis provided within their FEATS report for these tidal channel cross-section surveys. In addition to this preliminary analysis that is instrumental for this project, the results may also</p>

provide insight into climate change-mediated sea level rise impacts on tidal channels.

Makah Nation - Consistent and Vocal Policy Presence on Freshwater/Terrestrial Issues and Integration of Regional Research/Recovery Priorities: The Makah Nation successfully completed the Pysht River Restoration project, completing the demolition of an existing derelict structure (farmhouse) from the site, the removal of said structure, and the revegetation and noxious weed mitigation was performed. The Pysht River non-buffer area was the target for this time period (summer 2011) and the Pysht River buffer area is scheduled to be planted in the spring of 2012 per recommendations in the North Olympic Land Trust Stewardship Plan. The Makah Nation also continued to provide input in Puget Sound Partnership and local processes; and engaged in a subcontract with the Washington Department of the Ecology to re-activate the Sekiu and Clallam streamflow stations so that streamflow magnitude, duration, and frequency will once again be monitored and analyzed.

Nooksack Indian Tribe - Implementation of High Priority Salmon Recovery Projects: The Nooksack Indian successfully built 31 log jams on the North Fork Nooksack River to address factors most limiting Nooksack early Chinook and other salmonid populations and restore habitat conditions and habitat-forming processes. All 31 logjams were planted with native deciduous trees including willow and cottonwood, with 24 of the 31 structures planted with conifers. The remaining 7 logjams will be planted with conifers as nursery stock becomes available in January. Structure construction's impacts to fish were limited due to the guidance provided by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife under Nooksack Tribe's Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA). Nooksack Indian Tribe was able to overcome various permitting, material delivery, and equipment repair and replacement delays to implement their largest logjam construction project to date.

Samish Indian Tribe - Secret Harbor Estuary and Salt Marsh Restoration Monitoring of Fresh and Marine Ecosystems: Samish Indian Nation, working in a new location that was and is an extremely important area in Samish Traditional Territory, has made good progress to establish baseline ecological data that will provide the ability to analyze change as the saltmarsh restoration project is implemented. Five of eight EPA QAPPs have been written and approved, the MET tower has been installed, and data collection has begun for the MET tower, the avian surveys, and the water quality/temperature monitoring. Beach seining sites have also been selected and sampling is set to begin in the next reporting period. The Samish Indian Nation, in concert with their Washington State Department of Natural Resources partner, will be presenting the work that they have accomplished at the Salish Sea Conference in Vancouver, BC.

Swinomish Indian Tribe - Coast Salish Tribal Journey Water Quality Project (TJWQP): The Swinomish Indian Tribe, in partnership with the United States Geological Survey, coordinated with canoe families to conduct water-quality surveys, collecting 28,627 data points along three routes of the Tribal Journey from July 18 to July 25, 2011. The Squaxin Island Tribe, Swinomish Indian Tribe, Sauk-Suiattle Tribe, Squamish Nation, and Sliammon First Nation canoe families participated in the 2011 Project on their journey to Swinomish. Data quality procedures have been completed, trend charts and GIS data layers have been generated, and data was posted near real-time on the web (www.usgs.gov/coastsalish) using GoogleMaps, with initial results shared with canoe families during the landings.

(2) REFLECTION: We have successfully worked with the EPA to secure FY11 funding for our subrecipients and are currently engaging in the review cycle for FY11 proposals. Continued and consistent funding for these high priority tribal projects is of the utmost importance to Puget Sound restoration and protection and we look forward to continuing to work with the EPA in supporting our tribes and Puget Sound health.